

To: Bustos, Patrick[Bustos.Patrick@epa.gov]; Frizzell, Damon[Frizzell.Damon@epa.gov]; R7 Senior Staff[R7_Senior_Staff@epa.gov]; Slugantz, Lynn[Slugantz.Lynn@epa.gov]
From: Bryan, David
Sent: Thur 9/4/2014 1:01:12 PM
Subject: OPA Morning Clips - 9/4/14

St. Louis Post-Dispatch - Bridgeton Landfill barrier design to take at least another 18 months - 9/3/14- Construction on a barrier between the smoldering Bridgeton Landfill and the radioactive West Lake Landfill won't start for at least 18 months, according to a new analysis from the Army Corps of Engineers. http://www.stltoday.com/lifestyles/health-med-fit/health/bridgeton-landfill-barrier-design-to-take-at-least-another-months/article_bde48fb2-d0e3-5df7-a748-ab15aaf4bb15.html

GateHouse Media (McPherson Sentinel, Kansas) - Dangers left behind: Pollutants still remain at many Superfund sites - 9/3/14 - In recent years, the EPA has increasingly relied on use restrictions at Superfund sites to protect human health. These restrictions are meant to protect residents of Superfund sites where a cleanup leaves toxins behind, but they do not always work. <http://www.mcphersonsentinel.com/article/20140903/News/140909816>

Kansas Health Initiative - State prepping to push back on EPA carbon reduction deadline | KDHE official says Obama plan too aggressive in curbing emissions linked to climate change - 9/3/14 - An official with the Kansas Department of Health and Environment says it will be difficult for the state to have a plan in place by the proposed deadline to meet President Obama's order to curb emissions linked to climate change. <http://www.khi.org/news/2014/sep/03/state-prepping-push-back-epa-carbon-reduction-dead/>

Also KCUR Kansas City Public Radio

Blog for Iowa - Iowa Water Quality Public Hearings This Week - 9/3/14 - Here's a note from CCI: The rule passed by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (DNR) two weeks ago brings Iowa closer into compliance with the Clean Water Act for the first time ever. But, it can be stronger, and the DNR must enforce it. That's where your voice comes in. <http://www.blogforiowa.com/2014/09/03/iowa-water-quality-public-hearings-this-week/>

Dunkin Daily Democrat (Mo.) - Noranda announces lay-offs and scale backs in New Madrid - 9/3/14 - In a press conference Tuesday afternoon at Noranda Aluminum in New Madrid, Mo., CEO Kip Smith announced a series of layoffs and scale backs at the plant due to unaffordable power rates. <http://www.dddnews.com/story/2115058.html>

Lincoln Journal-Star - State Supreme Court to hear challenge to pipeline law - 9/4/14 - The nearly six-year debate over development of the Keystone XL pipeline reaches another crossroads on Friday. The Nebraska Supreme Court is set to hear oral arguments in Thompson v. Heineman, a challenge to the constitutionality of state law giving Gov. Dave Heineman the authority to both approve the pipeline's path

and dole out the power to force land agreements for its construction.

http://journalstar.com/news/local/state-supreme-court-to-hear-challenge-to-pipeline-law/article_3150bdcc-d085-51cf-9960-e244c7241d2f.html

Wichita Eagle (Kan.) - Kansas task force: No clear answers as to what's causing quake increase - 9/4/14 - There is insufficient research available to say what has caused an increase of earthquakes in Kansas, primarily in the south-central area, a governor-appointed task force concluded in a report that was made available this week. <http://www.kansas.com/news/state/article1491085.html>

Kansas City Business Journal - Burns & McDonnell's transmission and distribution sector ranks as world's best - 9/3/14 - A release from the Kansas City engineering and architecture firm said its transmission and distribution division — which builds high-voltage power lines, large power substations and energy distribution systems — topped the publication's 2014 list of firms providing engineering and design services in that sector. <http://www.bizjournals.com/kansascity/news/2014/09/03/burns-mcdonnell-energy-transmission-distribution.html>

Newsweek - Does the EPA Favor Industry When Assessing Chemical Dangers? - 9/3/14 - On a late spring morning in 2012, Michelle Boone settled into her seat on an expert panel at the U.S. Environmental Protection in Washington, D.C. As the day wore on, she felt more and more uneasy. The panel was part of the EPA's reassessment of the rules governing the use of the controversial pesticide, called Atrazine. <http://www.newsweek.com/does-epa-favor-industry-when-assessing-chemical-dangers-268168>

The Hill - GOP: Documents show green group's 'close relationship' with EPA - 9/3/14 - Senate Republicans released documents Wednesday that they say prove a "close relationship" between a major environmental group and the Environmental Protection Agency. <http://thehill.com/policy/energy-environment/216544-gop-documents-show-green-groups-close-relationship-with-epa>

Dailier Caller - Emails Suggest Enviro Groups Influence The EPA's Agenda - 9/3/14 - Emails released by congressional Republicans suggest environmentalists have used their cozy relationship with top Environmental Protection Agency officials to exert influence on public policy. <http://dailycaller.com/2014/09/03/emails-suggest-enviro-groups-influence-the-epas-agenda/>

Cedar Rapids Gazette (Iowa) - NextGen Climate: multimillion dollar attacks on Ernst working - 9/3/14 - In the battle of out-of-state interest groups, NextGen Climate, which is backing Democrat Bruce Braley's U.S. Senate bid, is claiming success in putting Republican Joni Ernst on the defensive. <http://www.kcrq.com/subject/news/politics/nextgen-climate-multimillion-dollar-attacks-on-ernst-working-20140903>

Wall Street Journal - The Climate Change Agenda Needs to Adapt to Reality - 9/2/14 - The Obama

administration is instituting a variety of far-reaching policies to reduce carbon emissions and mitigate climate change. Are any of these capable of making a difference? Simple arithmetic suggests not. <http://online.wsj.com/articles/edward-p-lazear-the-climate-change-agenda-needs-to-adapt-to-reality-1409700618>

Wall Street Journal

Opinion: The Climate Change Agenda Needs to Adapt to Reality

Limiting carbon emissions won't work. Better to begin adjusting to a warmer world

By EDWARD P. LAZEAR

Sept. 2, 2014 7:30 p.m. ET

The Obama administration is instituting a variety of far-reaching policies to reduce carbon emissions and mitigate climate change. Are any of these capable of making a difference? Simple arithmetic suggests not. Given this reality, we would be wise to consider strategies that complement and may be more effective than mitigation—namely, adaptation.

According to the Paris-based International Energy Agency, in 2012 the world emitted a little over 31 gigatons of carbon dioxide. China was the No. 1 emitter, accounting for more than one-fourth of the carbon produced. The U.S. was second, emitting about one-sixth.

China and India, among other developing countries, argue that they should be allowed to increase carbon emissions. They're still developing and require higher rates of economic growth. Moreover, they aren't responsible for previous emissions, and on a per capita basis U.S. emissions are much higher.

These arguments have merit but must be measured against the reality of carbon growth. Consider China: Its carbon emissions increased by an average 8.6% a year between 2002 and 2012. Were China to

continue at this pace for 27 years until it reaches today's U.S. GDP per capita, it would emit 99 gigatons of carbon in 2041 alone, or three times the world's current emissions.

This scenario is too pessimistic. As countries develop, they become more efficient in energy use. But even if China tapered its emissions growth from 8.6% to zero over the same 27 years, it would still emit as much carbon in 2041 as the entire world does today. And that's not including emissions growth from India, Africa and South America.

Is there any hope of limiting carbon emissions to 30-50 gigatons in 2030, as many climatologists have called for, with substantial reductions thereafter? Some countries, notably Denmark and Sweden, have significantly reduced emissions. Can the U.S. do the same?

Feel-good actions won't make a dent. For example, it is fashionable to favor locally grown produce in part to reduce the carbon from transport. But transport from producer to retailer is a trivial part—less than 5%—of energy used in the life cycle of produce. Almost all of the emitted carbon is associated with production, which means that growing a tomato bound for Chicago in an Illinois winter hothouse rather than outdoors in Florida is not a carbon-saving strategy.

How about using public transportation, driving carbon-friendly vehicles, living closer to work, or biking instead of driving? Suppose that the U.S. completely eliminated carbon emissions from transportation over the next four years. The IEA data show that world emissions would still rise because the reduction from the U.S. would not cover the increase in carbon emitted by the rest of the world. Without world-wide changes, there is limited gain, even from dramatic action by the world's second-largest emitter.

The economics also work against a major transformation in the technology of producing power, either mobile or stationary. Coal is cheap. Natural gas is becoming even cheaper, but its carbon emissions, according to the U.S. Energy Information Administration, are still half those of coal and three-quarters those of gasoline per unit of energy produced. Although a switch to natural gas for many power uses would help, and accounts for recent drops in U.S. emissions, it cannot change the carbon arithmetic enough to prevent the world from exceeding "safe" levels.

Unless an economical low-carbon source of power generation becomes available, it is unrealistic to expect that countries, especially developing ones, will accede to any demand to produce power in a higher-cost manner merely to emit less carbon.

Very high carbon taxes or severely restrictive cap-and-trade policies might provide substantial motivation to conserve. These could reduce carbon-intensive consumption and motivate a switch to lower carbon power sources like nuclear. But these actions are undesirable because of their adverse effects on the economy. Australia instituted a \$22 per ton carbon-dioxide tax in 2012. It repealed the highly unpopular

measure this July, mainly because of its economic costs and perceived ineffectiveness. Research and development are worthwhile. But they can be wasteful and ineffective—recall Solyndra—and if R&D is to be government sponsored, all developed countries should participate in funding.

Given these limitations on mitigating carbon emissions, it is important to study how to adapt to climate change. There are myriad possibilities for adaptation, including the obvious, like building dikes in low-lying areas, and planting heat-tolerant crops and trees in cities. Some adaptation will occur naturally. For example, economic incentives will induce people who are setting up new households, businesses and farms to move to areas that are less severely harmed by warming temperatures.

Organizations like the U.N.-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change have pushed adaptation as a complementary strategy to mitigation. Still, adaptation has received little attention by the Obama administration and is hardly mentioned in public discussion. Proponents of strong anti-carbon measures seem to believe that even considering an alternative to mitigation will weaken the public's willingness to bear the costs of mitigation.

Carbon math makes clear that without major effort and a good bit of luck, we are unlikely to control the growth of emissions enough to meet the standards that many climate scientists suggest are necessary. It is time to end the delusions and start thinking realistically about what can and will be done.

Mr. Lazear, chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers (2006-09) and head of the White House committee on the economics of climate change (2007-08), is a professor at Stanford University's Graduate School of Business and a Hoover Institution fellow.